

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. Claims 1, and 3-6 are pending for examination. Claim 1 has been amended. The examiner notes new grounds of rejection have been established. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1, and 3-6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. in view of Tran.

As per claim 1, Johnson et al. teaches automatically, that is, independent of any required human intervention: (see at least, col. 6, lines 44-62; the examiner notes a scanning process with OCR would be an automatic process) i) receiving over a transmission channel an electronic representation of an form that embodies a report concerning at least one parameter from at least one sender, the form having a plurality of data fields each corresponding to an indicator of at least a partial value of at least one of the parameters (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-62, col. 9, lines 6-36); ii) identifying the

location of the data fields in the received representation of the image of the form (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-62, col. 9, lines 6-36); and iii) both extracting report data from the report and storing the extracted report data in a predetermined common format in a memory for subsequent processing (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-67-col 7, lines 1-18, col. 9, lines 6-36); for at least one third party, storing a set of party-specific rules in the memory associating the received report with the corresponding third party and associating at least one fourth party with the sender and with at least one of the third parties (see at least, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43); in which the third party is an agency that communicates with the central computer system using an agency computer system; the fourth party is a client of the agency and communicates with the central computer system using a client computer system, the agency and client being contractually related entities; the sender is a person referred by the agency to the client and performs work tasks for the client; and further comprising via a publicly accessible transmission network, receiving access requests from the agency and the client sent through their respective computer systems for portions of the extracted report data defined according to the respective party-specific rules, and responding to the

access requests by returning the requested report data to the agency and client, respectively, including automatically, that is independent of any required human intervention, completing any requests for interactive and iterative **review** (see at least, col. 9, lines 66-col. 10, lines 20), modification, or annotation, inclusive of the report data by the agency and client according to each party's respective rules; whereby the central computer system is an intermediary system between the sender on the one hand and the agency and client on the other hand and exposes different interface to the sender, agency and client (see at least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43, col. 14, lines 5-25: The examiner notes that subscribers/providers can all retrieve reports format. There can be multiple providers accessing multiple forms of data related to a subscriber.)

The examiner notes Johnson et al. fails to explicitly teach the time worked by the sender on behalf of the client.

Tran teaches a parameter includes time worked by the sender on behalf of the client (col. 3, lines 11-15).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Johnson et al. to include parameter includes time worked by the sender on behalf of the client as taught by Tran. One of ordinary

skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide accurate work related charges, with less errors due to incorrect data entry and/or misreading of a users hand writing (see at least, col. 3, lines 15-17).

As per claim 3, Johnson et al. discloses storing the extracted report data in the memory in a predetermined common format; before transferring the extracted report data to any third party, converting the extracted data into a format specified by the rules associated with that party, whereby their parties operating different hardware platforms and processing software may receive and process the extracted report data form the same memory within the central computer system (see at least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43, col. 14, lines 5-25).

As per claim 4, Johnson et al. fails to explicitly disclose further comprising the step of storing in the memory third-party annotations associated with the extracted report data.

However Tran discloses further comprising the step of storing in the memory third-party annotations associated with the extracted report data (see at least, col. 18, lines 15-16).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Johnson et al. to include further comprising the step of storing in the memory third-party annotations associated with the extracted report data as taught by Tran. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 1, above.

As per claim 5, Johnson et al. disclose receiving from a third party, a confirmation or rejection indication relating to at least a portion of the extracted, stored report data, and upon receipt of the rejection indication, directing the sender to resubmit a corrected report (see at least, col. 10, lines 36-53: the examiner notes a notification of data would be a confirmation).

As per claim 6, Johnson et al. discloses storing an image of the report as received; via the network, allowing access by the third party to the image, whereby the third party is able to confirm the accuracy of the extracted report data port data form the same memory within the central computer system (see at least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43, col. 14, lines 5-25).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3627

Asfand M Sheikh
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

/Asfand M Sheikh/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

12/21/2007